

### 1 3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 2 3.8.1 Environmental Setting

##### 3 3.8.1.1 Environmental Database Findings

4 An online review of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)  
 5 Envirostor database on July 10, 2014, determined that one site is currently listed within  
 6 approximately 0.5 mile of the Project area. This site is a tiered permit status site  
 7 associated with the EPS, which was closed in 2004.

1 The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) (2015) GeoTracker database was  
2 also reviewed in July 2015 for information on any documented sites of environmental  
3 concern in the Project area. Four closed sites were identified by GeoTracker at the  
4 EPS, and included soil contamination of diesel, gasoline, and heating or fuel oil, and  
5 non-polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) transformer oil. Two sites were closed by the  
6 SWRCB in 1996, the others were closed in 2005 and 2015. Only one records pertaining  
7 to any of the sites closed in or before 2005 are available through the GeoTracker  
8 website. A March 16, 2005, letter from the County of San Diego Department of  
9 Environmental Health (SDDEH), Land and Water Quality Division (2005) regarding site  
10 T0608160564 indicated that the site, used for fuel tank farm operations, was  
11 investigated for diesel and heavy metals. Contaminated soil with diesel and heavy  
12 metals was found at shallow depths, and groundwater had a low concentration of  
13 dissolved diesel and trace amounts of some heavy metals. To meet the cleanup goals  
14 for the site, soil remediation was performed in 2004 in eight areas with total petroleum  
15 hydrocarbon (TPH) concentrations higher than 1,000 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) by  
16 excavating and recycling 4,426 cubic yards of contaminated material. The letter further  
17 stated that changes to the proposed use of the site as mixed residential/commercial  
18 may require reevaluation to determine if the change would pose a risk to public health,  
19 and that any contaminated soil excavated as part of subsurface construction work must  
20 be managed in accordance with the legal requirements at that time.

21 The fourth closed site, Spills, Leaks, Investigation, and Cleanup Site (SLIC) Local Case  
22 # H13941-005 (GeoTracker ID T10000003098), was identified approximately 420 feet  
23 southeast of the beach valve pit. This case, which was closed as of May 6, 2015, was  
24 the result of a 2011 underground transformer release from EPS Unit 5 main transformer  
25 cooling piping. According to the case closure summary, approximately 400 gallons of  
26 non-PCB transformer oil leaked to the ground. The ruptured pipes were immediately  
27 repaired and approximately 20 cubic yards of impacted soil were excavated from the  
28 leak area. Soil sampling was conducted and the results of analysis showed low levels of  
29 transformer oil remaining at 3 feet below grade. However, it was concluded that  
30 because the transformer oil residue at the site is likely made of low-toxicity and low  
31 mobility petroleum hydrocarbons, the residue, which has been capped with asphalt can  
32 be left in place and does not pose a significant health risk (County of San Diego  
33 Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division 2013).

34 An open Cleanup Program Site (Local Case # H13941-004, GeoTracker ID  
35 SLT19726861) (SWRCB 2014a; 2014b; 2014c, Rincon Consultants, Inc. 2014a; 2014b)  
36 was also identified near the administration building (under construction) at the EPS.  
37 This site was initially associated with the fuel oil leak in November 2007. Several  
38 additional Voluntary Assistance Program applications, assessments, action plans, and  
39 SDDEH communications are associated with Local Case # H13941-004, GeoTracker ID  
40 SLT19726861 for other documented sites of environmental concern within the EPS.

Most of the documented sites of environmental concern were identified during construction of the Poseidon Carlsbad Seawater Desalination Plant, which is located in areas previously occupied by EPS petroleum storage tanks and a wastewater treatment plant, when contaminants associated with past handling, storage, and use of petroleum hydrocarbons were encountered. Documented sites of environmental concern in the area of the EPS tank farms are not discussed here because the closest tank site to the proposed Project is located more than 1,300 feet east of the beach valve pit. The documented sites of environmental concern closest to the Project are discussed below.

On August 6, 2013, petroleum hydrocarbon odors were detected during initial excavation and construction of the Intake Pump Station (located 200 feet east of the beach valve pit) for the Carlsbad Desalination Plant. Soil samples were evaluated and found to contain diesel and motor oil. Soil assessment and remedial measures to be implemented during construction of the Intake Pump Station and 72-inch Water Supply and associated Discharge Lines were proposed with cleanup goals as approved by the SDDEH for the EPS (Rincon Consultants, Inc. 2013). In July 2014, petroleum hydrocarbon odors were also reported during excavation for a 72-inch underground water supply line at the EPS. Rincon Consultants conducted soil assessment and remediation at the excavation site, which is located approximately 370 feet east of the beach valve pit. Soil samples were taken and assessed, and it was determined that TPH concentrations exceeded the established cleanup goals for two samples; other samples did not exceed cleanup goals. The contaminated soil was excavated and disposed off-site; however, contaminated soil south of the sample locations was not assessed as it was outside of the area of concern (Rincon Consultants, Inc. 2014b).

#### 3.8.1.2 Asbestos-Containing Material

Royal Environmental Services, Inc. (Royal) was retained by Cabrillo to test the fuel oil submarine pipeline and associated facilities for asbestos-containing materials (ACM). A February 2013 report by Royal (see Appendix D) identifies three materials associated with the pipeline that contained asbestos:

- Gray/black colored pipe mastic which underlies the concrete covering on the pipeline and is also present in patches along the pipeline;
- Gray pipe wrap on the pipeline at the joint with the concrete wall at the west end of the underpass end structure; and
- Black pipe wrap on the pipeline and attached 6-inch bypass pipe.

#### 3.8.1.3 Lead-Based Paint

Royal conducted testing of lead-based paint (LBP) on surfaces within the vertical vault of the beach valve pit and the fuel oil submarine pipeline under Carlsbad Boulevard to determine whether the paint contains lead. One gray-painted steel pipe (approximately

20 feet long and 1 inch in diameter) located within the vertical vault of the beach valve pit and tunnel (i.e., the beach valve pit horizontal shaft, underpass conduit, and underpass end structure horizontal shaft and vertical vault) under Carlsbad Boulevard was identified as having lead equal to or greater than the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health LBP threshold (0.06% by weight or 600 ppm) and the USEPA LBP threshold (0.5% by weight or 5,000 ppm) for worker protection. Because of the loose, flaky, and/or otherwise damaged LBP found on the steel pipe, the paint/pipe requires abatement prior to demolition or handling for metal recycling. Royal also opined that other similarly gray-painted equipment/facilities in the EPS likely contain LBP and should also be abated prior to demolition.

#### 3.8.1.4 Other Known and Potentially Unknown Contaminants

The beach valve pit and vertical concrete vault have features such as an existing drain that, if compromised, could have released petroleum hydrocarbons to surrounding soils. Similarly, in the event that there were past pipeline leaks, soil in the immediate area of the pipeline could contain petroleum hydrocarbons and/or other chemicals of concern.

Royal collected samples of loose soil collected in the vertical vault of the beach valve pit and the fuel oil submarine pipeline tunnel under Carlsbad Boulevard (approximately 10 feet into the tunnel from the vertical vault of the beach valve pit). Testing of the soil samples for TPH, with a carbon range of C6 through C36 (from gasoline to oil), was conducted by Calscience Environmental Laboratories using USEPA Method 8015 Modified. As reported by Royal, the soil from the floor of the vertical vault of the beach valve pit contained TPH at 35,000 mg/kg and the sample from the tunnel contained TPH at 1,300 mg/kg. Although soils with these levels of TPH do not meet the definition of a hazardous waste, they must be managed as petroleum containing special waste. The Royal report does not identify the source of these soils or contamination; however, it states that soils further from the vertical vault of beach valve pit (i.e., within the tunnel) likely contain lower or no concentration of TPH.

A gravel sump, which is open on the bottom, is located on the beach below the fuel oil submarine pipeline (see Figure A1-2 in Appendix A). If the pipeline had leaked between the beach valve pit and sump, any fuel oil released would likely have collected in the sump due to the site topography, which slopes toward the beach.

#### 3.8.1.5 Fuel Oil Submarine Pipeline Contents

According to the EPS Fueling Administrator, the fuel oil submarine pipeline was pigged and flushed three times to bring the hydrocarbon level below 15 ppm; no surfactant was used. The pipeline was also charged with Nalco EC6106A corrosion inhibitor to prevent internal corrosion of the pipeline. The flushed water was tested for Hexane Extractable Materials (oil and grease) by the San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) Environmental

- 1 Analysis Laboratory (September 29, 2010) using USEPA Method 1664A (SDG&E
- 2 2010). Table 3.8-1 shows the test results.

**Table 3.8-1. Pipeline Flush Water Analytical Results**

Analyte	Results in milligrams per liter (mg/L)
Pipeline water during first pig	11
Pipeline water after first pig	USEPA Method 1664A could not be used due to the high concentration of oil in the sample. Visual estimation put this value at 3 percent oil. The upper practical limit for this method for a 1-liter sample is 1,000 mg/L.
Pipeline water after second pig	14
Pipeline water after third pig	Non-detect

- 3 The fuel oil submarine pipeline is presently filled with 1,450 barrels of potable water and
- 4 385 gallons of Nalco EC6106A, a preservative approved by the CSLC to protect the
- 5 pipeline (a Material Safety Data Sheet for Nalco EC6106A is provided in Appendix B).
- 6 The pipeline is under vacuum and has shown no signs of leakage.

## 7 3.8.2 Regulatory Setting

### 8 3.8.2.1 Federal and State

- 9 Federal and State laws and regulations pertaining to this issue area and relevant to the
- 10 Project are identified in Table 3.8-2.

**Table 3.8-2. Laws, Regulations, and Policies (Hazards/Hazardous Materials)**

<b>U.S.</b>	Clean Water Act (CWA) (33 USC 1251 et seq.)	The CWA is comprehensive legislation (it generally includes reference to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972, its supplementation by the CWA of 1977, and amendments in 1981, 1987, and 1993) that seeks to protect the nation's water from pollution by setting water quality standards for surface water and by limiting the discharge of effluents into waters of the U.S. ( <i>see below and in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality</i> ).
<b>U.S.</b>	California Toxics Rule (40 CFR 131)	In 2000, the USEPA promulgated numeric water quality criteria for priority toxic pollutants and other water quality standards provisions to be applied to waters in the State of California. USEPA promulgated this rule based on the Administrator's determination that the numeric criteria are necessary in the State of California to protect human health and the environment. Under CWA section 303(c)(2)(B), the USEPA requires states to adopt numeric water quality criteria for priority toxic pollutants for which the USEPA has issued criteria guidance, and the presence or discharge of which could reasonably be expected to interfere with maintaining designated uses. These Federal criteria are legally applicable in California for inland surface waters, enclosed bays, and estuaries.
<b>U.S.</b>	Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA) (49 USC 5901)	The HMTA delegates authority to the U.S. Department of Transportation to develop and implement regulations pertaining to the transport of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes by all modes of transportation. Additionally, the USEPA's Hazardous Waste Manifest System is a set of forms, reports, and procedures for tracking hazardous waste from a generator's site to the disposal site. Applicable regulations are contained primarily in CFR Titles 40 and 49.
<b>U.S.</b>	National Oil	Authorized under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation,

**Table 3.8-2. Laws, Regulations, and Policies (Hazards/Hazardous Materials)**

	and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) (40 CFR 300)	and Liability Act of 1980, 42 USC 9605, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, Pub. L. 99 through 499; and by CWA section 311(d), as amended by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA), Pub. L. 101 through 380. The NCP outlines requirements for responding to both oil spills and releases of hazardous substances. It specifies compliance, but does not require the preparation of a written plan. It also provides a comprehensive system for reporting, spill containment, and cleanup. The U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) and USEPA co-chair the National Response Team. In accordance with 40 CFR 300.175, the USCG has responsibility for oversight of regional response for oil spills in “coastal zones,” as described in 40 CFR 300.120.
<b>U.S.</b>	Oil Pollution Act (OPA) (33 USC 2712)	The OPA requires owners and operators of facilities that could cause substantial harm to the environment to prepare and submit plans for responding to worst-case discharges of oil and hazardous substances. The passage of the OPA motivated California to pass a more stringent spill response and recovery regulation and the creation of a State Office of Spill Prevention and Response to review and regulate oil spill plans and contracts.
<b>U.S.</b>	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) (42 USC 6901 et seq.)	The RCRA authorizes the USEPA to control hazardous waste from “cradle-to-grave,” which encompasses its generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal. RCRA’s Federal Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments from 1984 include waste minimization and phasing out land disposal of hazardous waste as well as corrective action for releases. The Department of Toxic Substances Control is the lead State agency for corrective action associated with RCRA facility investigations and remediation.
<b>U.S.</b>	Toxic Substances Control Act (15 USC 2601–2692)	This Act authorizes the USEPA to require reporting, record-keeping, testing requirements, and restrictions related to chemical substances and/or mixtures. It also addresses production, importation, use, and disposal of specific chemicals, such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, and petroleum.
<b>U.S.</b>	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Act of 1980 to Prevent Pollution from Ships requires ships in U.S. waters, and U.S. ships wherever located, to comply with International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships.</li> <li>• Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea. These regulations establish “rules of the road” such as rights-of-way, safe speed, actions to avoid collision, and procedures to observe in narrow channels and restricted visibility.</li> <li>• Inspection and Regulation of Vessels (46 USC Subtitle II Part B). Federal regulations for marine vessel shipping are codified in 46 CFR parts 1 through 599 and are implemented by the USCG, Maritime Administration, and Federal Maritime Commission. These regulations provide that all vessels operating offshore, including those under foreign registration, are subject to requirements applicable to vessel construction, condition, and operation. All vessels (including motorboats) operating in commercial service (e.g., passengers for hire, transport of cargoes, hazardous materials, and bulk solids) on specified routes (inland, near coastal, and oceans) are subject to requirements applicable to vessel construction, condition, and operation. These regulations also allow for inspections to verify that vessels comply with applicable international conventions and U.S. laws and regulations.</li> <li>• Navigation and Navigable Waters regulations (33 CFR) include requirements pertaining to prevention and control of releases of materials (including oil spills) from vessels, traffic control, and restricted areas, and general ports and waterways safety.</li> </ul>
<b>CA</b>	Coastal Act Chapter 3 policies (see	Section 30232 states: <i>Protection against the spillage of crude oil, gas, petroleum products, or hazardous substances shall be provided in relation to any development or transportation of such materials. Effective containment and</i>

**Table 3.8-2. Laws, Regulations, and Policies (Hazards/Hazardous Materials)**

	also Table 1-2)	<i>cleanup facilities and procedures shall be provided for accidental spills that do occur.</i>
<b>CA</b>	Lempert-Keene-Seastrand Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act (Gov. Code, § 8574.1 et seq.; Pub. Resources Code, § 8750 et seq.)	This Act and its implementing regulations seek to protect State waters from oil pollution and to plan for the effective and immediate response, removal, abatement, and cleanup in the event of an oil spill. The Act requires vessel and marine facilities to have marine oil spill contingency plans and to demonstrate financial responsibility, and requires immediate cleanup of spills, following the approved contingency plans, and fully mitigating impacts on wildlife. The Act assigns primary authority to the Office of Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR) division within the CDFW to direct prevention, removal, abatement, response, containment, and cleanup efforts with regard to all aspects of any oil spill in the marine waters of the State. The CSLC assists OSPR with spill investigations and response.
<b>CA</b>	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California Clean Coast Act (SB 771) establishes limitations for shipboard incinerators, and the discharge of hazardous material—including oily bilgewater, graywater, and sewage—into State waters or a marine sanctuary. It also provides direction for submitting information on visiting vessels to the CSLC and reporting of discharges to the State water quality agencies.</li> <li>• California Harbors and Navigation Code specifies a State policy to “promote safety for persons and property in and connected with the use and equipment of vessels,” and includes laws concerning marine navigation that are implemented by local city and county governments. This Code also regulates discharges from vessels within territorial waters of the State of California to prevent adverse impacts on the marine environment. This Code regulates oil discharges and imposes civil penalties and liability for cleanup costs when oil is intentionally or negligently discharged to the State waters.</li> <li>• California Seismic Hazards Mapping Act (Pub. Resources Code, § 2690) and Seismic Hazards Mapping Regulations (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, Div. 2, Ch. 8, Art. 10) (<i>See Section 3.6, Geology and Soils</i>).</li> <li>• Hazardous Waste Control Act (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 26) defines requirements for proper management of hazardous materials.</li> <li>• Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Cal. Water Code, § 13000 et seq.) (<i>See Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality</i>).</li> </ul>

1 3.8.2.2 Local

2 The City of Carlsbad (undated[a]) General Plan contains the following hazardous  
3 materials-related goal and policy relevant to onshore Project activities.

- 4 • Goal: A City which minimizes injury, loss of life, and damage to property resulting  
5 from hazardous materials disaster occurrence.
- 6 • Policy 1: Review land use decisions to consider constraints presented by the  
7 potential for on-site and off-site contamination by use, transfer, storage, or land  
8 disposal of hazardous materials and wastes. Land use decisions should be  
9 consistent with Federal, State and county environmental regulations.

10 The McClellan-Palomar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (County of San Diego  
11 Airport Land Use Commission 2010) establishes an Airport Influence Area, which

identifies areas likely to be impacted by noise and flight activity created by aircraft operations at the airport. The Airport Influence Area also identifies areas where new development may adversely affect airport operations.

### 3.8.3 Impact Analysis

#### ***a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***

**Less than Significant with Mitigation.** Decommissioning activities have the potential to impact the public or environment. For example, the removal of the fuel oil submarine pipeline and other equipment/facilities could result in the release of ACM or LBP into the environment, exposing workers, and potentially the public, to asbestos- or lead-related health hazards. The pipeline currently contains water and a preservative, which, along with any unanticipated residual oil in previously pigged pipelines, could also be released to the environment. Further, due to the site's previous use of transferring of oil, decommissioning activities requiring soil excavation have the potential to expose workers to contaminants. Lastly, accidental spills of petroleum (including diesel fuel) from Project vessels may occur; other Project vessel discharges would be in accordance with applicable regulations.

To ensure that potential hazards or hazardous materials impacts to the public and environment are avoided or mitigated to less than significant, **MM BIO-7: Oil Spill Response Plan (OSRP)**, **MM BIO-8: Flush Fuel Oil Submarine Pipeline**, and the following measures would be implemented.

**MM HAZ-1: Certified Asbestos Abatement Contractor.** Pipeline removal shall be conducted in accordance with all regulations pertaining to asbestos utilizing a certified asbestos abatement contractor to perform any such work.

**MM HAZ-2: Licensed/Certified Lead-Based Paint (LBP) Contractor.** A California licensed contractor certified by the California Department of Public Health shall be contracted to accomplish LBP abatement prior to the commencement of onshore demolition and to ensure proper disposal of paint flakes (which must be handled as a hazardous waste), abated pipes, and equipment.

**MM HAZ-3a: Extended Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA).** An extended Phase I ESA review, as well as the assessment of soils around and in the beach valve pit, shall be conducted to address potential soil contamination issues at the Project site prior to the commencement of decommissioning activities. If contamination is identified, the appropriate measures to address the hazard shall be added to the Contractor Work Plan. This may include excavation and removal of contaminated soil to a legal disposal site, or onsite treatment of



contaminated soil. A copy of the Phase 1 ESA shall be provided to California State Lands Commission staff within 2 weeks of completion.

**MM HAZ-3b: Personnel Trained to Work with Hazardous Substances.** All work requiring removal of facilities shall be conducted by personnel trained to work with hazardous substances and any suspicious soils (stained or with an unusual odor) or groundwater (showing a sheen or with an unusual odor), shall be tested and treated in accordance with all applicable laws.

**MM HAZ-4: Disposal of Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon (TPH)-Containing Soil.** Soil in the bottom of the beach valve pit known to have levels of TPH shall be disposed of as a petroleum-containing special waste.

As discussed in Section 4.6, Cultural Resources, due to the presence of archaeological site CA-SDI-210 and the paleontologically sensitive Santiago Formation, any remediation efforts that could disturb previously undisturbed earth material would have the potential to result in impacts to cultural resources. Mitigation involving the use of archaeologists, Native Americans, and/or paleontologists would necessitate that these monitors be appropriately trained to work with hazardous substances.

***b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?***

**Less than Significant with Mitigation.** Decommissioning activities include the use of offshore vessels and offshore and onshore equipment that may result in the accidental release of hazardous materials, and subsequent environmental and human exposure, due to accidental spills of petroleum (including diesel fuel) from Project vessels or accidental releases of fuels, lubricants, or other materials. To ensure that potential impacts associated with the accidental release of hazardous materials are avoided or mitigated to less than significant, the following measures would be implemented.

**MM HAZ-5: Onshore Hazardous Materials Management and Contingency Plan Measures.** The onshore contractor shall develop and implement hazardous materials management and contingency plan measures for onshore operations. The measures shall be provided to California State Lands Commission staff as part of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan or a separate plan prior to Project implementation. Measures shall include, but not be limited to, identification of: appropriate fueling and maintenance areas for equipment; best management practices for fueling and operation of equipment (e.g., daily inspection of equipment); a spill response; and spill response supplies to be maintained onsite.

***c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** The closest school to the Project site is Jefferson Elementary School located at 3743 Jefferson Street, which is 0.95 mile to the north based upon the Carlsbad Unified School District (2014) online School Locator measuring tool. Hazardous materials that may be encountered during Project decommissioning (e.g., LBP, ACM, hydrocarbons) as described above would be very localized and would not impact the closest school. Short-term air pollutants from construction vessels and equipment are discussed in Section 3.3, Air Quality.

***d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?***

**Less than Significant with Mitigation.** As described above, the EPS is included on a list of hazardous materials sites (per Gov. Code, § 65962.5, commonly referred to as the "Cortese List") (SWRCB 2015; DTSC 2015). Specifically, an open Cleanup Program Site (Local Case # H13941-004, GeoTracker ID SLT19726861) is located at the EPS. No documented sites of environmental concern associated with Local Case # H13941-004, GeoTracker ID SLT19726861, nor any closed sites within the EPS are within Project boundaries; however, as discussed under item **a)** above, if contamination is encountered during decommissioning activities, there would be the potential for health-related hazards to workers and possibly the public. Implementation of **MM HAZ-3a** and **MM HAZ-3b** would ensure that the potential for environmental or human health impacts from exposure to hazardous material sites is avoided or reduced to less than significant.

***e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

**No Impact.** The McClellan-Palomar Airport is located about 3 miles southeast of the Project site. Based on a review of McClellan-Palomar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (County of San Diego Airport Land Use Commission 2010), the Project site is not located within an airport safety zone; therefore, no impacts would occur.

***f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

**No Impact.** There are no private airstrips located in proximity to the Project site; therefore, no impacts would occur.

***g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

**No Impact.** According to the City of Carlsbad's (undated[b]) website, the San Diego County Office of Emergency Services is responsible for maintaining the county emergency plan, which facilitates regional mutual aid. The City of Carlsbad's Emergency Management Administrative Team maintains the Carlsbad Emergency Operations Plan (City Plan). These plans are consistent and interoperable to maximize regional mutual aid support. Based upon a review of the Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organizational Area Emergency Plan (2010) (County Plan), the Project does not include any elements that would interfere (physically or operationally) with this plan. Because the City Plan is consistent and interoperable with the County Plan, the Project would not interfere with implementation (physically or operationally) of the City Plan; therefore, no impacts would occur.

***h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?***

**No Impact.** The Project site is not in or adjacent to a wildland fire hazard area; therefore, no impacts would occur.

#### **3.8.4 Mitigation Summary**

Implementation of the following mitigation measure(s) would reduce the potential for Project-related impacts to hazards and hazardous materials to less than significant.

- MM HAZ-1: Certified Asbestos Abatement Contractor.
- MM HAZ-2: Licensed/Certified Lead-Based Paint Contractor.
- MM HAZ-3a: Extended Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA).
- MM HAZ-3b: Personnel Trained to Work with Hazardous Substances.
- MM HAZ-4: Disposal of Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon (TPH)-Containing Soil.
- MM HAZ-5: Onshore Hazardous Materials Management and Contingency Plan Measures.
- MM BIO-7: Oil Spill Response Plan (OSRP).
- MM BIO-8: Flush Fuel Oil Submarine Pipeline.